of the government, and that past history is in strict accordance with the views I have advanced.

For Vermont, the constitution was formed by a convention in July, 1777. It was revised by a convention December 25, 1777, without authority of Congress. "The constitution was not ratified by the people." I quote from Thompson's "Vermont." part 2, page 105. The application for admission was made February 9, 1791, and the State was admitted March 4, 1791, as I find from the Statutes at Large, vol. 1, page 191.

Kentucky applied for admission through the delegates of a convention December 9, 1790; her constitution was not then formed. My authority is the appendix to the House Journal, vol. 1, pages 411-12. She was admitted June 1, 1792; her constitution was laid before Congress November 7, 1792, as I learn from the House Journal, vol. 1, page 614. There is no evidence that the constitution was submitted to a vote of the people.

For Tennessee, the constitution was formed by a convention without authority of Congress, February 6, 1796, as I learn from American State Papers, "miscellaneous," vol. 1, pages 146-7. She applied for admission April 8, 1796, as is shown by Senate Journal April 11, and House Journal April 8, 1796. She was admitted June 1, 1796. The constitution was not submitted to the people, but it was forwarded to the Secretary of State, I learn from the Annals of Tennessee, pages 656-7, and the History of Tennessee, page 471.

For Ohio, the constitution was formed by a convention, under authority of Congress, November, 29, 1802, as is shown by the Statutes-at-Large, vol. 2, pages 173, 201.

but it was forwarded to the Secretary of State, I learn from the Annals of Tennessee, pages 656-7, and the History of Tennessee, page 471.

For Ohio, the constitution was formed by a convention, under authority of Congress, November, 29, 1802, as is shown by the Statutes-at-Large, vol. 2, pages 173, 201. She applied for admission January 7, 1803, as is shown by the Senate journal, vol. 3, page 251. She was admitted February 19, 1803, as I find in the Statutes-at-Large, vol. 2, page 201. The constitution was not submitted to the people, as I learn from Howe's Historical Collections of Ohio, page 16.

In Louisiana, the constitution was formed by a convention January 22, 1812, under authority of Congress of the date of February 19, 1811. I refer to the Statutes-at-Large, vol. 2, page 641. She was admitted April 8, 1812, and there is no evidence that the constitution was submitted to a vote of the people.

The constitution of Indiana was formed by a convention June 29, 1816, under authority of Congress as I find in the Statutes-at-Large, vol. 3, page 399. Her constitution was submitted to Congress June 10, 1817, as is shown by the House journal, second session, Twenty-fourth Congress, page 180. There is no evidence that the constitution was submitted to a vote of the people.

The constitution of Mississippi was formed by a convention August 15, 1817.—I again refer to the Statutes-at-Large, vol. 3, page 348.) Her constitution was submitted to a vote of the people.

The constitution of Illinois was formed by a convention August 26, 1818, under authority of Congress, (see Statutes-at-Large, vol. 3, page 348.) Her constitution was submitted to a vote of the people.

The constitution of Illinois was formed by a convention August 26, 1818, under authority of Congress, (see Statutes-at-Large, vol. 3, page 348.) Her constitution was submitted to a vote of the people.

The constitution of Alabama was formed by a convention August 26, 1818, under authority of Congress, (Statutes-at-Large, vol. 3, page 356.) There is no evide

(the people.
The constitution of Alabama was formed by a conven-

The constitution of Alabama was formed by a convention August 2, 1819, under authority of, Congress, (Statutes-at-Large, vol. 3, page 489;) her constitution was submitted to the House of Representatives December 6, 1819; and she was admitted December 14, 1819, (Statutes-at-Large, vol. 3, page 608.) There is no evidence that the constitution was submitted to the people.

The constitution of Maine was formed by a convention, without authority of Congress, October 29, 1819. Her constitution was submitted to Congress December 8, 1819, (see House Journal, First Session Sixteenth Congress, pages 18—60;) and she was admitted March 15, 1820. The constitution was submitted to a vote of the people, as I learn from Williamson's History of Maine, vol. 2, page 674.

as I learn from Williamson's History of Maine, vol. 2, page 674.

The constitution of Missouri was formed by a convention, 19th July, 1820, under authority of Congress, (Statutes at-Large, vol. 3, page 545.) Her constitution was submitted November 16, 1820. One of my authorities is Mr. Lowndes's report, November 23, 1820, (American State Papers, "Miscellaneous," vol. 2, page 625.) The joint resolution admitting the State on a "certain condition" was approved March 2, 1821. The condition was accepted, and the State admitted by proclamation of the President of August 10, 1821. There is no evidence that the constitution was submitted to a vote of the peo-

that the constitution was submitted to a vote of the peo-ple.

The constitution of Michigan was formed by a conven-tion under the authority of the ordinance of 1787, and without the authority of Congress. It was submitted to and ratified by the people, (see Lammon's History of Michigan, pages 241, 243; also, Senate Documents 5 and 211, Twenty-fourth Congress, first session, and Reports of Committees of the House of Representatives, first session Twenty-fourth Congress, 380. She was admitted on the condition that she should amend her constitution so as to change her boundary, (Statutes-at-Large, vol. 5, page 49.)

The constitution of Arkansas was formed by a conven-The constitution of Arkansas was formed by a convention without authority of Congress. I refer to House Documents, Twenty-fourth Congress, first session, No. 164; Niles's Register, vol. 49, page 243, for Attorney General's opinion; and for debates, to "Congressional Debates." vol. 12, parts 1 and 2. She was admitted with a constitution, by joint resolution, June 15, 1836. The constitution was not submitted to the people.

The constitution of Florida was formed by a convention without authority of Congress, and submitted to the people. (See House Doc. 208, Twenty-fifth Congress, third session, and Statutes-at-Large, vol. 5, page 742.) She was admitted with a constitution March 3, 1845.

The constitution of Wisconsin was formed by a convention under authority of Congress. (Statutes, vol. 9, page 66; and House Doc. 49, Twenty-ninth Congress, second session.) She was admitted on certain conditions. (Statutes, vol. 9, page 178.) The constitution had not been submitted to the people previous to her application with a constitution. For debates see Congressional Globe and

sional Globe and on. For debates see Congress

The constitution of Iowa was formed by a convention on the 18th of May, 1846, without authority of Congress, and was submitted to the people. (See House Doc. 16, Twenty-uinth Congress, second session, page 17.) She was admitted with her constitution March 3, 1845.

Twenty-uinth Congress, second session, page 17.) She was admitted with her constitution March 3, 1845.

The constitution of California was formed by a convention without authority of Congress, and it was submitted to and ratified by the people. (See Senate Mis. Doc. 68, page 14, Thirty-first Congress, first session.) She was admitted September 9, 1850.

I have thus, as briefly as I could, undertaken to show, first, that Kansas is, under the Louisiana treaty, under the law of Congress, under the Louisiana treaty, under the law of Congress, under the Kansya-Nebraska act, under the special pledge of the democratic party in the Cincinnati Convention, entitled to admission, having now a republican form of government; second, that the convention was legally and fairly called, sanctioned by the federal authorities, acting in conformity with the territorial government, not in conflict, not in antagonism, not in opposition; third, I have shown that the presumption is that the convention fairly and truly represented the people and reflected their will. On this point we have heard of broken pledges and violated promises. We have heard of vows that have not been fulfilled, but we have na evidence on the subject.

I heard the senator from Illinois also make remarks here touching what would be the final result of the submission of the slave question; that he had no doubt "peturns" would come in, intimating that he believed frauds would be perpetrated. But eight months ago, who so loud, so forcible, and so eloquent as the senator from Illinois in denouncing the party that had insinuated fraud ! On what evidence is it that he would insinuate that frauds will be committed in the returns that are to come when the question of slavery shall be submitted. I

On what evidence is it that he would insinuate that frauds will be committed in the returns that are to come in when the question of slavery shall be submitted. I have no right to impute fraud. I never will impute fraud. Fraud is to be proved, not presumed. When the honorable gentleman occupied a place on the bench, if an attorney had made an arrangement like that he would be ready almost to strike his name from the roll of attorney. or presuming fraud? None that I have seen; and he does us injustice if he has it in his possession and retains it as a secret; it ought to be developed; it ought to come be-fore the country in a tangible shape, for we are as much responsible for our action when that action depends on

facts as the honorable senator himself.

The legal presumption is, that the representative reflects the will of the represented. There is no evidence before us conflicting with that legal presumption. The election has not yet taken place. Is there any preparation for fraud? Have schemes been concocted, have plans been devised by which fraud is to be perpetrated in the voting upon that question? I will not believe it in advance of the fact itself. Is it for that reason the honorable senator thinks this whole matter should be reversed, the whole subject thrown back, and a complete revival of the complication of difficulties that have beset us on our western border? Is it because of the want of an enabling act, for he has voted the other way in several instances. I have shown that it cannot be for the want of submitting the whole question to the people, be-

cause he has voted the other way in several other instances. I have shown that this convention was legally and constitutionally called. That he admits. I have shown that the legal presumption is, that they reflect the will of the people. Is there, then, any rebutting evidence? There is nothing else in the preceding part of the argument to justify his now separating from us, and, when we come to this bifurcated road, his taking the left hand. Is there any reason why he should do it on this simple, anticipatal idea of fraud, on which there is no particle of evidence before us? No; the legal presumption still stands unassailed. The legal presumption still potent enough to justify our action on it, and we must act on it.

In the next place, I have shown that the convention

In the next place, I have shown that the convention In the next place, I have shown that the convention was under no obligation, imposed either by law or usage, to submit the constitution to a vote of the people. Further, I have shown, I think, that a majority of the States entered the Union with constitutions not previously submitted to the people. If Kansas has copied the example set by a majority of its clder sisters, surely nothing will be urged in complaint against Kansas because it did not follow the minority. It is true, I heard the senator commending the rule, which he says is found in the Minnesota bill.

Here I will remark that, as far as I have examined

Here I will remark that, as far as I have examin Here I will remark that, as far as I have examined the law—and I have examined every case I could—I find, from the beginning of the government, in 1789, down to the present day, there never was a prerequisite, even where Congress passed an enabling act, that the result of the convention should be submitted to the people, save in the Minnesota bill. It was not in the Ohio bill; it was not in the Indiana bill; it was not in the Illinois bill; it was not in the Alabama bill; it was not in the Mississippi bill. The other States were formed on their own responsibility, without an enabling act. In none of those enabling acts—not even in the Wisconsin bill—was there a provision requiring the constitution to be submit.

own responsibility, without an enabling act. In none of those enabling acts—not even in the Wisconsin bill—was there a provision requiring the constitution to be submitted to the people. In no bill, save one, that ever passed Congress, was any such provision contained. If the convention of the Territory of Kansas deemed it proper to copy the example which Congress had set, which a majority of sister States had set, I can see in this no cause of objection to Kansas at our hands.

Again: I have shown that the only question about which there is any controversy is separately submitted to a fair vote of the people. About this I have no doubt or controversy. The only question that has been a bone of contention, that has been the cause of stirring up strife, that has been made the pretext for assaults on different sections of this Union—that one single, important question is submitted to a fair vote of the people. What the result of that vote will be it is impossible for me to foretell. This much, however, I can with propriety say: If a majority of the people there are determined not to have African slaves, it would be folly, by any scheme, by any trick, to get up a constitution adverse to the will of the majority, and hence I am glad this slavery question is fairly submitted. Although I greatly prefer having no constitutional and no legal barriers, though I subscribe most heartily to the doctrine of climate, of production, and of vocation, and think it the only sound solution of this question within the limits of the federal Union; still, my opinion is not to be set up as dictatorial to influence others. It is but my individual property; I shall act upon it so far as I am able. As it is thus submitted, it is the only question of controversy. Who is it that complains of any provision in the Kansas constitution? and on it so far as I am able. As it is thus submitted, it is the only question of controversy. Who is it that complains of any provision in the Kansas constitution? and who is it that could complain of a provision in that constitution who did not have a fair opportunity to make it otherwise, if he is in the majority? and if he is in the minority, let him complain and gnash his teeth in vain. Minorities are expected to complain; but it is the duty of minorities to submit as gracefully as their feelings will well permit. If they were the majority, they had the opportunity to make it otherwise. If they did not choose to exercise their right, it is their fault and their misfortune. If the majority have exercised their legal rights in an honorable, upright, and fair manner, they are not to be forced to give way to a factious minority.

I have also shown there is no legal objection prudential consideration, to prevent the admission of Kansas. How, then, are we to act on this subject? Are we to go back and travel over the detail of circumstances

we to go back and travel over the detail of circumstances that occurred in Kansas, so far as presented in the Presi-lent's message? It is unnecessary, except so far as they sear on the fairness of this convention, the fair opportubear on the fairness of this convention, the fair opportu-nity for the free expression of the will of the people. Whether the President's reasoning be right or wrong, let it pass. It ought to commend him for his patriotism, for his disinterested view, and for the sound conclusion at which he arrives. With this commendation, and with this support, whether he is right or wrong in saying the law requires the slave branch of this controverted matter to be submitted to a vote of the people, I shall not utte

he word of complaint.

There is a still greater object in view than to look back There is a still greater object in view than to look back at the past, and find fault with this or that proceeding which occurred in Kansas. This is the President's view. Practical men must take hold of subjects and act in a practical manner, to effectuate the most good in a constitutional and legal way. From all the investigation I have given to this subject, I am satisfied that the good of Kansas, the good, the peace, the prosperity of the whole Union will be affected more or less by the decision that Union will be affected more or less by the decision that we make on this Kansas question. If Congress keeps it open, if excitement is still to spread through the land, if a system of warfare is to be gotten up plunging the land in gloom, and perhaps reaching to the extreme of sheding human blood, the consequences will be on those who reopen the slave question, the Kansas question, the squatter-sovereignty question, or any other question connected with the well-being of Kansas. If there be any question that can be fairly decided in Kansas, it is the slave question. I believe that it will be fairly decided of a malelieve the constitution meets the approphation of a male tion. I believe that it will be fairly decided there. I believe the constitution meets the approbation of a majority of the organized and loyal people of Kansas. In regard to that, I have no question or doubt, and my belief, founded on the slight sources of information I possess, is at least to be treated as a set-off to the fear of fraud, and the allegation of improper influences, on the part of the people of Kansas, as alleged by the senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, I have thus given my views of this subject. I have elaborated no single point. It has been my purpose simply to show that there is no obstacle in the way, and that there are considerations why, in conformity with the past action of the country, we should admit Kansas at once. I believe she has acted as fairly as any other Territory. I have stated the reason why I as any other Territory. I have stated the reason why I have given my view of the case. Whether the constitution will come up in the one shape or the other, is a subject about which I have no right to express an opinion. Whether it will come up at all or not, I am not able to say, though I apprehend it will. I have only felt bound to meet the objections urged by the senator, because I thought they would have a prejudicial effect upon the country, and an exceedingly prejudicial effect in Kansas, where an election is to be held on the 21st of this month. It is true, little that I can say or little that others can say will reach Kansas before the election; but, at least, both sides ough to be partially heard—heard enough, at least sides ough to be partially heard—heard end n to be partially heard—heard enough, at least, re them together and see which is in conformity federal constitution, and which is in conformity to compare them together and see which is in conformit with the federal constitution, and which is in conformit with the law, which is in conformity with the practice the government. Whether I have succeeded in showing that the position I take is correct, is, of course, for other

DISCOVERY OF TITIAN'S PICTURES. - A discovery of great in erest to the artistical world, says the Paris Press, was lately made by M. Edmond About, the writer, while going through the shop of a collector of curiosities in the Rue Du Bac. After examining different articles, the master of the place inormed his visitor that he had in his possession twelve pictures by Titian, and, taking him into an inner room, showed them as they hung against the wall. These pic-tures are four feet long by nine inches high, and represent the history of Joseph, according to biblical tradi-tion. In support of his assertion that the pictures were genuine, the dealer produced letters from M. Flandrin and M. Delacroix, stating that the pictures were very valuable. In a short time M. About and the owner carr to terms, and the pictures were placed in the hands of a cleaner, who, after a first operation, remarked that in all the pictures Joseph bore a resemblance to Charles V. which was considered in favor of their authenticity The cleaner, in following up his operations, soon afterwards discovered in a corner the signature of Titian, the worded, Tisianus Vercilius da Cadore pinzit.

CONGRESSIONAL. Thirty-Fifth Congress-First Ser

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1857.

SENATE.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, MEMORIAIS, Mrc.
The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate copies

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate copies of the laws of the Territory of Kansas, passed at the second session of the general legislative assembly begun and held at the city of Lecompton on the second Monday of January, 1857; which, on motion by Mr. COLLAMER, were referred to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a memorial from William B. Davis, praying that the Commissioner of the General Land Office may be required to make a statement showing the territories acquired since the revolution, and the number of square miles in each, for publication.

Also, a resolution of the Academy of Natural Science, in favor of the publication of the report of the geological survey of the Territories of Oregon and Washington, made by Dr. John Evans. The above communications were severally referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CHANDLER presented a joint resolution of that State into two judicial districts; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GREEN presented a memorial from the legislature of Missouri, in relation to Wolf Island, the jurisdiction over which is in dispute between that State and Kentucky, praying that he land may be sold in order that purchasers may test the question of jurisdiction in the federal courts. Several other petitions were presented, which were appropriately referred.

he following resolution, which was submitted by SEWARD some days ago, was taken up and sgreed

to:

Resolved, That the joint Committee on Printing inquire
and report whether any new provisions of law are necessary to secure a faithful performance of the existing contracts which provide for accurate reports of the debates of

on motion by Mr. Walds, a resolution was adopted re-questing the Secretary of War to communicate to the Sen-ate what estimates, if any, have been made for the im-provement of the following harbors on Lake Erie: at Buffalo, Dunkirk, Erie, Conneaut, Ashtabula, Grand River, Cleveland, Black River, Vermillion, Sandusky Bay, La Plaisance Bay, or River Raisin, and Maumee Bay

On motion by Mr. SEBASTIAN, a resolution was ad

ouri, and report by bill or otherwise.

On motion by Mr. HAMLIN, a resolution was adopted requesting the Court of Claims to return to the Senate the papers in relation to the claim of Amos and John E. Kendall, referred to that court by the order of the Senate of

Mr. GWIN submitted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate be authorized to assign a furnished room in the Capitol extension for the sessions of the select committee on the Pacific

railroad.

Mr. IVERSON suggested that a room should also be assigned for the Committee of Claims, as their present room was dark and inconvenient.

Mr. COLLAMER proposed to extend the resolution by amending it so as to add the following.

"And that the Committee on Public Buildings inquire and report to the Senate a plan for assigning the rooms in the addition to the Capitol appropriated to the use of the Senate." enate."
The amendment was agreed to, and the resolution

mended was adopted.
On motion by Mr. SLIDELL, a resolution was adopted On motion by Mr. SLIDELL, a resolution was adopted requesting the President to communicate to the Senate a record of the proceedings of the several naval courts of inquiry organized under the act of Congress approved January 16, 1857, to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the efficiency of the navy."

Subsequently, Mr. CRITTENDEN moved to reconsider the vote on the adoption of Mr. SLIDEL's resolution, as he thought it premature, and that it might, perhaps, do mis chief. The motion to reconsider lies over.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CLAY asked and obtained leave to introduce a bill Mr. ClaY asked and obtained leave to introduce a bill to detach Selma, in the State of Alabama, from the collec-tion district of New Orleans, and make it a port of delivery within the collection district of Mobile; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Commerce. Mr. CRITTENDEN asked and obtained leave to intro-duce a bill for the relief of Robert Dixon, of the Kentucky

teers; which was read twice and referred to littee on Pensions. WILSON asked and obtained the unanimous

sent of the Senate to introduce a bill to secure to actual settlers the alternate sections of public lands reserved in the grants to the States for railroads; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and obtained leave to intro-

Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and obtained leave to introduce a bill to provide for the examination and payment of certain claims of citizens of Georgia and Alabama on account of losses sustained by the depredations of the Creek Indians; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. JOHNSON, of Tennessee, asked and obtained leave to introduce a bill to grant to every person who is the head of a family and a citizen of the United States a homestead of 160 acres of land out of the public domain, on condition of occupancy and cultivation of the same for the period herein specified; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MASON, from the Committee on Foreign Rela-tions, reported a bill for the relief of Alexander J. Ato-chā; which was read and passed to a second reading. Mr. FOOT, from the Committee on Foreign Relati to whom was referred the bill for the relief of Georg Marsh, reported it back and recommended its passage

AFFAIRS IN KANSAS.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the President's nnual message, and Mr. STUART stated that he had yielded the floor this norning, by request, to Mr. Fircu, who desired to ex-ress his views.

Mr. FITCH remarked that if the election took place Mr. FITCH remarked that it the election took place in Kansas yesterday, congressional action on the subject would soon be required—that is, assuming that there were no frauds which would vittate that election. In expressing his views on the question, he desired that the decision of the people of the Territory, whether to admit or to exclude slavery, should not be supposed to influence his opinions; and he therefore wished to speak on the subject in advance of any rossible knowledge here of the ject in advance of any possible knowledge here of the character of the proceedings at the election. He would remark, in advance, that while he should feel bound to remark, in advance, that while he should feel bound to comment on some of the views expressed by the senator immediately before him, [Mr. Dovulas,] he did not design to read him out of the party; but he would say that a man might, by his own voluntary act, either by promoting discord in the party or by some other means, place himself beyond the pale of the party organisation; and he hardly thought the old democratic party, as such, were put to the necessity of reading persons out of their organisation. If, however, there were any men in the democratic party who wished to take a position outside of the party, or who attempted to foment discord in the party, in return for some fancied grievance in time past, they would do well to remember the fate of every such attempt that had ever been made, from the days of Burr

to those of Van Buren.

Mr. F. proceeded to remark that the argument of Mr. Douglas was based upon the assumption that the Kansas act and the repeal of the Missouri-compromise line had imposed on the people of the Territories the necessity of acting, in their primary capacity, on every legitimate subject of State legislation embraced in whatever constitution they may send to Congress, as a preliminary to its recognition here.

mate subject of State legislation embraced in whatever constitution they may send to Congress, as a preliminary to its recognition here.

He denied that this assumption was correct, and argued at some length in support of his position. He could see no other course for Congress to adopt in the present emergency than to admit Kansas as a State with whatever constitution she may present here; first being satisfied as to whether it was a republican form of government; and, second, whether it emanated from a legal source and was formed in a legal manner.

He would have preferred that the entire constitution should have been submitted to the people of Kansas and yet the power of the convention to submit it or to withhold it was, to his mind, unquestionable; and the convention are responsible alone to the people of Kansas for the manner in which they exercised that power. His destre was to have that course adopted which should be productive of the least evil to the greatest number.

Mr. DOUGLAS deemed it necessary to reply to some portions of the remarks of the senator from Indiana. He said that, according to his own showing, that senator differed from the President on two points, while he himself comply differed from the President on two points, while he himself issue, toge exceed \$20 par.

The que

mere servile tool of any President, so as to feel himself bound to take every recommendation without examining to see whether it met his approbation or not. As to harmony in the democratic smators and the President would stand by the Cincinnati platform there would be harmony between them all and himself. "Call it faction—call it what you please," said he, "I intend to stand by the Nebraska bill, to stand by the Cincinnati platform, to stand by the organization and principles of the party; and I defy opposition from whatever quarter it comes." He proceeded to predict that before the layse of sixty days he would be in barmony with those that were most relied upon now to crush him and the principles of the Nebraska bill in the admission of the Lecompton constitution. He regarded the convention as a trick and a fraud upon the rights of the people, and, with slavery or without slavery, he was opposed to the whole concern. He added that he did not know what was the object of all these attacks upon him; perhaps his opponents thought they could worry him out. But he would tell them that, if he found his strength failing, he would go off and recruit his energies, and come back and take a raking fire at the whole of them. [Laughter.]

A conversational debate then ensued between Mr. Doroalas and Mr Firca, in the course of which Mr. D., in order to sustain his previous remark that he could not place much confidence in the returns of the election which was to have been held yesterday, said that the convention had declared null all the laws furnishing fraudulent returns, and stated, in addition, that two officers of the army who were present in Lecompton at this time had informed him that the very man who was known to have perpetrated the Oxford frauds was elected clerk of the convention by acclamation, upon the ground that his services in Johnson county entitled him to it.

Mr. CLAY thought those remarks were calculated to one of their official duties, and on failure thereof shall be subject to the same pains and penalties

rauds in making returns.

Mr. CLAY asked whether the ipse dirit of the governo

Mr. CLAY asked whether the pse and of the governor was to prevail over the law?

Mr. DOUGLAS remarked that the clause which the senator from Alabama had read was in the constitution published in the "Intelligencer," but in the constitution published in the "Union," and which is said to have been furnished by the President to the "Union," that clause was not to be found. He could not pretend to account for not to be found. He could not pretend to account for this variance, unless it was that the convention adjourned without putting the constitution into form, and perhaps the "Intelligencer" was furnished with a revised copy, and the "Union" printed the document as it was before the convention. Whether it be so or not, it does not place the matter under the territorial laws, where there were penalties for fraudulent returns.

Mr. CLAY said the senator was mistaken; for he had read from the schedule as published in the "Union."

Mr. DOUGLAS would look into the matter, and if he found he was mistaken, he would publicly acknowledge it.

found he was mistaken, he would publicly acknowledge it.

Mr. STUART then obtained the floor, and the further
consideration of the subject was postponed until to-mor-

After the consideration of executive business,

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

After prayer by Rev. Dr. Gurley, the journal of yester After prayer by Rev. Dr. Guriey, the jointed by years and approved.

Mr. GIDDINGS, of Ohio, having asked to be excused from further service on the Committee of Claims, on the ground of physical debility, was relieved by the House.

On motion of Mr. J. GLANCY JONES, of Pennsylva nia, the House went into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, (Mr. Printer, of Missouri, in the chair.) and after laying aside—ayes 95, noes 73—House bill No. 4, and several appropriation bills, proceeded to the consideration of Senate bill to authorize the issue of

the consideration of Senate bill to authorize the issue of treasury notes.

Mr. GROW, of Pennsylvania, contended that a proper economy in the conduct of the government could only be regulated by the departments. The government came to ask money to pay its debts. The ordinary sources of revenue were dry, and the government was unable to meet its liabilities. The question presented was whether this government should make a loan, or whether it would issue treasury promises to pay when it had nothing in its vaults to make the payment. In his opinion, the last sinancial crisis sprang from expanded credit. In 1837 it sprang from an expanded paper currency without a metallic basis. That state of things did not exist to-day. The coinage of the mint from the formation of the government to the present time amounted to \$549,000,000; the importations of gold and silver gave \$290,000,000 more, which made a total of \$842,000,000. By sending the government out to borrow money upon an issue of the government out to borrow money upon an issue of stock, \$20,000,000 of this specie would be compelled to come forth, because the paper proposed to be issued

to come forth, because the paper proposed to be issued was not to become currency.

By the plan of the bill it was proposed to issue a paper currency, and send it out, perhaps, never to come back. In conclusion, Mr. G. submitted an amendment authorizing the borrowing of \$10,000,000 in such sums as might be required upon an issue of the United States stock, the time for negotiating the loan to expire on the 20th of June. 1859.

20th of June, 1859. On motion of Mr. J. GLANCY JONES, of Pennsyl on motion of Mr. J. GLANCY JONES, of Pennsylvania, the committee then rose, and the House resumed its session. After the adoption of the usual resolution terminating debate in one hour after its resumption, the House again went into committee.

Mr. SMTPH, of Virginia, replied to the speeches which had been made by the opposition. He showed conclusively that this bill for the issue of \$20,000,000 in treasury notes, for the surpose of raising money to weet the

ury notes, for the purpose of raising money to meet the the exigencies of the country, and only intended for

relief.

Mr. ADRAIN, of New Jersey, defended the President from the charge that he had made a violent attack on the banking institutions of the country. On the contrary, the President had declared in his message that it would be unwise to do anything to strike these institutions

Mr. E. JOY MORRIS, of Pennsylvania, thought tha Mr. E. JOY MORRIS, of Pennsylvania, thought that this measure was the first step towards that policy with which the government commenced—the policy of provi-ding the federal government with a national currency. For one, however wide he might differ with others, he avowed it frankly, he was in favor of a national bank, with proper restrictions, similar to those which General Jackson had said might be made. He rejoiced to see that the present administration recognised its duty to provide a national currency; for notwithstanding the fact that the treasury notes proposed to be issued would not be of a higher value than \$100, yet so far they would prove a na-tional currency.

tional currency.

Mr. J. GLANCY JONES, of Pennsylvania, stated the Mr. J. GLANCY JONES, of Pennsylvania, stated that the Secretary of the Treasury had said that in consequence of the peculiar exigencies of the country, and the externe reduction in the exports and imports, and the revenue necessary for the current fiscal year, it might be necessary for the government to resort to a loan. The Secretary had not asked for an issue of treasury notes for the purposes of currency, for facilitating exchange—certainly not to furnish a circulating medium—and had not even asserted that the money asked for might be required necessarily, but he did ask Congress to furnish him with the power of negotiating a loan, and nothing more nor less than a loan. He reiterated his assertion, that the money was needed, not to pay the debts of the administration, but of Congress, and hoped that the bill would speedily be passed. would speedily be passed.

Debate was then closed, and the bill read by sections

for amendment.

Mr. QUITMAN, of Mississippi, move to amend the first section by striking out the words "one hundred, and inserting "one thousand," so that the value of the notes would be increased to \$1,000.

would be increased to \$1,000.

Mr. SMITH, of Virginia, moved to amend the amendment by substituting "five hundred" for "one thousand."

The question being taken on the amendment to the amendment, it was disagreed to.

The question recurring on the amendment,

Mr. WARREN, of Arkansas, moved to amend it by striking out "one thousand" and inserting "fifteen hundred;" which motion was decided in the negative.

The amendment was then disagreed to—ayes 76, nocs 105.

105.
Mr. BANKS of Massachusetts, moved to amend by adding to the first section a clause providing that the President of the United States, instead of issuing the President of the United States, instead of issuing the whole amount of these treasury notes authorized by the first section of the bill, should borrow, on the credit of the United States, such an amount of money as he might deem proper, and should issue therefor stock bearing interest at a rate not less than six per cent., and redeemable on the 1st day of December, 1859, provided that the issue, together with the stocks outstanding, should not exceed \$20,000,000, and no stock should be issued below par.

The question was taken, and the amendment was disa

Mr. RARKSDALE, of Mississippi, then moved in enacting clause of the bill be striken out; which ; having been agreed to, The committee rose and reported the bill to the the recommendation that the enacting of

mmendation of the committee being disa

The recommendation of the committee being disagreed to, under the operation of the previous question, the bill was ordered to a third reading; and, liaving been read a third time, passed—yeas 118, nays 86—as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Adrain, Ahl, Anderson, Arnold, Atkins, Avery, Barksdale, Bishop, Bocock, Bowle, Boyce, Branch, Bryan, Burnett, Burns, Caskie, Chapman, Clark of Connecticut, Clark of Missouri, Clay, Clemens, Clingman, Cobb. John Cochrane, Cockerill, Comins, Cox, Craig of Missouri, Craige of North Carolina, Crawford, Curry, Davidson, Davis of Indiana, Dean, Dewart, Dimmick, Dowdell, Edmundson, Elliott, Eastie, Paulkner, Florence, Foley, Gartrell, Gillis, Gilmer, Goode, Greenwood, Gregg, Groesbeck, Hall of Ohio, Harris of Maryland, Haskin, Hatch, Hawkins, Hill, Houston, Hughes, Huyler, Jackson, Jenkina, Jewett, J. Glancy Jones, Owen Jones, Keitt, Kelly, Lamar, Landy, Letcher, McKibbin, McQueen, Marshall of Illinois, Maynard, Miles, Miller, Millson, Montgomery, Moore, Morris of Pennsylvania, Morris of Illinois, Niblack, Pendleton, Peyton, Phelps, Phillips, Beady, Reagan, Reilly, Ricaud, Ruffin, Russell, Sandidge, Scales, Scott, Seward, Shaw of Illinois, Shaw of North Carolina, Smith of Illinois, Smith of Tennessee, Smith of Virginia, Stallworth, Stephens, Stevenson, Stewart of Maryland, Talbot, Taylor of New York, Taylor of Louisiana, Thayer, Ward, Watkins, White, Whiteley, Wilson, Winslow, Woodson, Wortendyke, Wright of Georgia, and Wright of Tennessee—118.

NAYS—Messrs. Abbott, Andrews, Banks, Bennett, Billinghurst, Bingham, Blair, Bliss, Brayton, Buffinton, Burlingame, Burroughs, Campbell, Case, Chaffee, Clawson, Clark B. Cochrane, Colfax, Cragin, Curtis, Danrell, Davis of Maryland, Davis of Misassippl, Davis of Massachusetts, Davis of Iowa, Dawes, Dick, Dodd, Durfee, Fenton, Foster, Gilman, Goodwin, Granger, Grow, Hall of Massachusetts, Harlan, Harris of Illinois, Hoard, Horton, Howard, Jones of Tennessee, Kellogg, Kelsey, Kilgore, Knapp, Kunkel of Maryland, Kunkel of Pennsylvania, Leech, Leiter, Lov

ADJOURNMENT FOR THE HOLIDAYS.

On motion of Mr. WASHBURN, of Illinois, the following joint resolution, received from the Senate, was taken from the Speaker's table:

\*\*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.\*\* That when the two houses adjourn on the 23d instant they adjourn to meet on the 4th of January next.

Mr. WARREN, of Arkansas, moved that the resolution be laid on the table; which motion was not agreed to.

Mr. JONES, of Tennessee, moved that the House adjourn, and that when it adjourn to-morrow it adjourn tomeet on Friday next; which motions were respectively decided in the negative.

The question was then taken on the passage of the resolution, and it was passed—yeas 97, nays 88—as follows:

resolution, and it was passed—yeas 97, nays 88—as follows:

YEAS—Messra Ahl, Anderson, Andrews, Arnold, Banks, Bennett, Bingham, Bishop, Biair, Bowie, Boyce, Branch, Brayton, Bryan, Buffinton, Burlingame, Campbell, Caskie, Chaffee, Chapman, Clark B. Cochrane of New York, John Cochrane of New York, Comins, Cox, Craige of North Carolina, Crawford, Damrell, Davis of Maryland, Davis of Massachusetts, Davis of Iowa, Dawes, Dewart, Dimmick, Dodd, Edmundson, Faulkner, Florence, Gillis, Gilman, Gilmer, Groesbeck, Hall of Ohio, Hall of Massachusetts, Harris of Maryland, Haskin, Hawkins, Hill, Hoard, Hopkins, Horton, Huyler, Jackson, Jenkins, Kelly, Kunkel of Maryland, Kunkel of Pennsylvania, Lamar, Landy, Leiter, McKibbin, McQueen, Maynard, Miles, Moore, Morgan, Morris of Pennsylvania, Mott, Palmer, Parker, Pendleton, Phillips, Pottle, Reagan, Ricaud, Roberts, Russell, Sandige, Scott, Seward, Shaw of North Carolina, Smith of Virginia, Spinner, Stallworth, Stewart of Pennsylvania, Taylor of Louisiana, Thayer, Thompson, Underwood, Waldron, Washburne of Wisconsin, Washburne of Hilinois, Washburn of Maine, Whitely, Winslow, Woodson, Wortendyke, and Wright of Georgia—97.

NAYS—Messrs, Abbott, Adrain, Atkins, Avery, Barksdale, Billinghurst, Bliss, Bocock, Burnett, Burns, Burroughs, Case, Clark of Connecticut, Clark of Missouri, Clay, Cobb, Cockerill, Colfax, Craig of Missouri, Curry, Curtis, Davidson, Davis of Indiana, Davis of Missouri, Clay, Cobb, Cockerill, Colfax, Craig of Missouri, Curry, Curtis, Davidson, Davis of Indiana, Davis of Missouri, Clay, Cobb, Cockerill, Colfax, Craig of Missouri, Curry, Curtis, Davidson, Barger, Greenwood, Gregg, Grow, Harlan, Harris of Illinois, Houston, Howard, Jewett, Jones of Tennessee, J. Glancy Jones, Of Pennessee, J. Glancy Jones, Of Pennessee, J. Glancy Jones, Oren Jones, Kellogg, Kelsey, Kilgore, Knapp, Leech, Letcher, Lovejoy, Marshall of Kentucky, Millet, Millson, Morrill, Morris of Illinois, Morse of Maine, Niblack, Nichols, Pettit, Phelps, Pike, Potter, Quitman, Ready, Reilly, Ro

Tennessee, Stanton, Stevenson, Stewart of Maryland Talbot, Tappan, Taylor of New York, Tompkins, Wade Walbridge, Walton, Warren, White, Wilson, Wright o Tennessee, and Zollicoffer—88.

And then, at ten minutes past 5 o'clock, the House

PETITIONS, ETC. By Mr. RUFFIN: The petition of Dr. D. H. Cherry, Wm. E. Ferrebee, and 50 others, citizens of Craven county, North Carolina, praying for the establishment of a mail-route from Newbern to Jackson, N. C. By Mr. FLORENCE: A bill to continue half-pay to

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS FROM DISTINGUISHED

Madison, (Indiana,) Dec. 14, 1857. DEAR SIR: The President's message did not reach here until the 11th. I am much pleased with the message, and particularly the part of it that relates to Kansas af

It seems very strange to me that Mr. Douglas, after being so great an advocate of popular sovereignty, and reiterating in so many speeches that the people of Kansas ought to be left free to decide the slavery question is their own way, should now object to the decision they propose to make upon this question the 21st of this He seems to be disposed to condemn in advance the decision they are about to make, and exhibits a de sire to point out the way, and prescribe the form himself doctrine now as it ever was, and that the legal representatives of the people in the Kansas convention can present "manage their own affairs in their own the questionway"-as well as any man or body of men outside of the

I have been a devoted friend of Judge Douglas, and spoke in his favor whenever I heard his name traduced. In 1856 I took a boat and went to Cincinnati to use my humble efforts to secure his nomination. I met many delegates on the boat and in Cincinnati, and found the the current was so strong for "Old Buck" that it was no use to attempt to stay the mighty torrent. I returned the next day with the mortification that Douglas's defeat before the convention was certain, but with a determina tion to support the nominee. But now I am happy to say the judgment of the convention was much better than my own, and we have reason to be thankful that the representatives of the democracy so wisely displayed their judgment in the selection of Mr. Buchanan.

The impression here is strong in favor of the Lecompon convention, which submits the slavery questiononly question in controversy—to a vote of the people, and every man in Kansas has the right to be heard upon that question. Could the most ultra pro-slavery or the one-idea abolitionist ask anything more? In the name of peace, let Kansas be admitted at once, and the controversy be settled.

INDIANAPOLIS, Dec. 15, 1857. DEAR SIR: I wrote you some days since, and immediately after I had read the President's message. lieved then, and I do now, that his views upon the Kan-

The President is unquestionably strong in the hearts of the democracy of Indiana. The people have confidence in his ability and integrity, and no man, however high his standing, or however great his ability, can lessen their

## WASHINGTON CITY

WEDNESDAY MORNING, DEC. 21, 1857

Ag-Mr. Israet E. James, of Philadelphia, is our general travelling agent, assisted by James Dezense, John Collins, J. Harmitt, Edition, W. Wilst, John S. D. Bernson, E. A. Evans, R. E. James, T. Assisa, P. A. Davis, R. T. Horsens, No. 1 Harrison street, Chortmath, Ohio, is our general collecting agent for the Western Sistes and Texas, assisted by H. J. Thomas, William H. Thomas, Ther. N. James, Dr. A. E. Chille, Gronom Monsie, and Riccard Laure. Receipts of either will be good.

Ag-Mr. Goo. W. Blazz is authorized to collect moneys due the Union Office for subscriptions and advertisements in the District of

CONGRESS-TUESDAY.

SENATE.—A large amount of morning business was transacted, among other things being the introduction of a homestead bill by Mr. Johnson, of Tonnessee. The remainder of the day was spent in the discussion of the Kansas policy of the President's mes sage, in which Messrs. Fitch, Douglas, and Clay par ticipated—Mr. Stuart still retaining the floor on the subject. After the consideration of executive business the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—The House took up. in Committee of the Whole, the bill authorizing the ssue of treasury notes; which was discussed by Mr. Grow of Pennsylvania, Mr. Smith of Virginia Mr. Adrain of New Jersey, Mr. E. Joy Morris and Mr. J. Glancy Jones of Pennsylvania. The debate was then closed; when, after several inffeectual atempts to amend the bill, it was passed by a vote of yeas 118, mays 86. The joint resolution from the Senate to adjourn from the 23d instant to the 4th of January was then taken up and agreed to; when the House adjourned.

KANSAS POLICY OF THE ADMINISTRATION The policy of the administration on the Kansas uestion is assailed from two quarters. The opposi tion to it from the black-republicans was expected. It was enough for them to know that it promised to produce peace and quiet to insure their usual bitter and acrimonious hostility. They have resorted to all their old charges, and but half conceal the pleasure they derive from an endorsement of them in democratic quarters. The country understands and apreciates the motive which lies at the bottom of all this abolition opposition. Excitement, turmoil, passion, and even bloodshed if it could be had, constitute the staple of black-republican politics. No two words in the English language are so terrible in the ears of these men as "peace and quiet !" Whatever, therefore, promises to give peace to the people of Kansas, and restore quiet to the country, is regarded by them with the same apprehension that a finid man feels in losing his heart's blood. Their occupation is gone, their principles are buried, and their organization, already on the eve of dissolution, car hardly hope to live to the time of another popular election if the Kansas question is settled, and renoved from the arena of party politics.

The good men of the country-those who wan eace and quiet, who have grown weary of this bit ter controversy-look with equal anxiety and earnestness for its peaceful and prompt settlement. Set tle the question upon fair and correct principles, and it matters not what may be the decision of the people of Kansas, whether for or against slavery, so it is their decision and in their own way, and all will be

It is with this feeling, and from these considera tions, that the great heart of the democratic party. North and South, has responded with such unanimi ty to the wise and patriotic policy of President Bu chanan for the final settlement of this long controversy. In recognising the legality of the action of the Lecompton convention, and expressing a willingness to aid in carrying into effect the action of that convention, he has marked out the only line of policy which gives promise of a fair, proper, and legal settlement. It is a policy based upon principle. It is in conformity to the uniform course of the democratic party on the Kansas question, and a departure from it at this time reopens the whole question for further agitation, and, as it would leave the country without a principle of action to stand apon, would produce greater difficulties than any that have been heretofore encountered. The vote on Monday last in Kansas on the question of slavery should be the closing scene of this drama in that Territory. The people of that Territory have pronounced their judgment for or against slavery; and though we do not know wha we do know that their will, if fairly expressed by them, should be regarded as binding upon Congress and the country. That point passed, the admission of Kansas as a free or slave State, as her people may have decided, puts an end to the controversy, and for the future leaves the matter purely and exclusively in the hands of her own people.

The other point of attack upon the policy of the administration is an unfair and unworthy effort to create distrust between the democracy of the North and the South. Our opponents ungraciously and improperly insinuate that the democrate of the North are prepared to sustain the policy of the administration only in the event that the people of Kansas vote out the slavery clause, and that the democrats of the South will sustain it only in the event of its being retained. The men who make these charges only show their own want of fairness by suspecting the integrity of others. We have no hesitation in saying to the black republicans that they need lay no such flattering unction to their souls. The policy of the administration in sustaining the action of the Lecompton convention is no mere expe dient resorted to for the occasion. It is based upon a great principle, for which the united democracy of the country have fought with unfaltering confidence in its justice and correctness. The administration will sustain it without regard to the result in Kansas The democratic party, North and South, will stand by it, whether it makes Kansas a free or slave State.

From the beginning of the Kansas issue to the present moment, there has been but one opinion with all true democrats, and that was and is, that the people of Kansas shall decide for themselves, and their own way, the question of slavery. The opportunity of making that decision was on Monday last given to the people, and whether all of her citizens have availed themselves of the right of voting or not we do not know. We hope all did; but the will of a people is expressed only through the ballot box on such an occasion, and those who do not choose t use the means which the law affords them of expressing their will cannot complain that their voice has not been heard. A fair election in Kansas on Monday ought and will settle the question in the honest judgment of all good democrats; and we GEORGE W. BREGA, ATTORNEY AND COUNSEL-doubt not that a democratic administration and a democratic Congress will so declare.